

Remarks

In the present response, claim 4 is canceled. Claims 1-3 and 5-25 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US publication number 2004/0212616 (Uthe). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 1 and 18 recite one or more elements not taught in Uthe. As one example, independent claim 1 recites arranging said resources representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicates relationships between particular resources of the respective column. Uthe does not teach this element.

Uthe teaches highlighting nodes and using call-out boxes to convey to a user that two nodes are the same (see Uthe at paragraph [0017]). Figure 1 in Uthe shows a multi-ownership tree-map, but this tree-map does not indicate a relationship of resources between columns and rows. Such a relationship is shown with highlighting and call-out boxes. Thus, Uthe does not teach or even suggest arranging resources representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicates relationships between particular resources of the respective column.

As one example, independent claim 18 recites viewing the graphic in a first direction represents a first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the second resource type, and viewing the graphic in a second direction different from the first direction represents a second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the third resource type. Uthe does not teach or suggest these elements.

Uthe teaches highlighting nodes and using call-out boxes to convey to a user that two nodes are the same (see Uthe at paragraph [0017]). Figure 1 in Uthe shows a multi-ownership tree-map, but this tree-map does not indicate a relationship of resources when viewed in a first direction and a second direction. Relationships in Uthe are shown with

highlighting and call-out boxes. Thus, Uthe does not teach or even suggest viewing the graphic in a first direction represents a first one of separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the second resource type, and viewing the graphic in a second direction different from the first direction represents a second one of separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the third resource type.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)). For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 18 are not anticipated by Uthe.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 2-17 and 19-25 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2004/0212616 (Uthe) in view of USPN 6,426,761 (Kanevsky). These rejections are traversed.

The claims recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Uthe in view of Kanevsky. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As one example, independent claim 14 recites that the relationship of the resources are shown in a hierarchical tree from placement of icons in columns with resources of a same type being in a same column. Uthe in view of Kanevsky does not teach or suggest this element.

Uthe teaches highlighting nodes and using call-out boxes to convey to a user that two nodes are the same (see Uthe at paragraph [0017]). Figure 1 in Uthe shows a multi-ownership tree-map, but this tree-map does not indicate a relationship of resources based on placement of icons in columns with resources of a same type being in a same column. Relationships in Uthe are shown with highlighting and call-out boxes.

Kanevsky teaches a large central icon with smaller icons arranged around the larger central icon. Kanevsky also states that the icons can also be arranged “in a circle or elliptical structure, icons in tree-like structure, and icons in 3-D clusters with bounding

regions of various shapes...” (see Kanevsky at column 5, lines 1-6). Notice, however, that nowhere does Kanevsky teach or even suggest that a relationship of resources is based on placement of icons in columns with resources of a same type being in a same column. Furthermore, Kanevsky is not showing resources in a hierarchical tree.

Further, as explained above, Uthe does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 18. Kanevsky fails to cure these deficiencies.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529